

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNIRAM TECHNOLOGY, INC.,

No. C 04-1268 VRW (MEJ)

Plaintiff(s),

vs.

**ORDER RE TSMC'S U.S. PATENT
NUMBERS '186, '050, AND '226**

MONOLITHIC SYSTEM TECHNOLOGY,
INC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

On August 29, 2006, the parties in the above-captioned matter filed a joint discovery dispute letter. (Doc. #231.) In the letter, plaintiff UniRAM Technology, Inc. ("UniRAM") sought to compel defendant Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company, Ltd. ("TSMC") to produce documents related to the conception, including initial invention disclosures and inventor notebooks, of the inventions disclosed and claimed in TSMC's U.S. Patent Numbers 6,136,638 ("'638"), 6,600,186 ("'186"), 6,661,050 ("'050"), and 6,420,226 ("'226"). In its portion of the letter, UniRAM set forth the relevancy of the '638 patent, but provided no information regarding the relevancy of the remaining three patents.

On September 11, 2006, the Court found that UniRAM had properly set forth the relevancy of the '638 patent and ordered production accordingly. (Doc. #236.) As to the remaining three patents, the Court permitted the parties to file additional briefing. UniRAM filed its letter on September 12 (Doc. #239) and TSMC filed its response on September 19 (Doc. #243). Upon review of the parties' further briefing, the Court finds that TSMC need not produce documents related to the

1 '186, '050, and '226 patents. UniRAM's '229 patent issued on August 22, 2000. Unlike the '638
2 patent, for which TSMC filed its application prior to the issuance of the '229 patent, TSMC filed the
3 remaining three patent applications after the issuance of the '229 patent. Accordingly, there is no
4 basis for compelling discovery of the remaining three patents.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6
7 Dated: September 26, 2006


8 _____
9 MARIA ELENA JAMES
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28